

## REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the detailed examination of the present application evidenced by the Office Action mailed March 16, 2007 ("Office Action"). On page 2, the Office Action appears to adopt an expansive interpretation of "connected to one another" to *mechanical* connection based on a plurality of dice being incorporated in a single component. See Office Action, p. 3. In response, Applicants have amended each of independent Claims 1, 12, 23 and 27 to recite *electrical* interconnection among the dice.

Applicants note that such electrical interconnection was the intent of the amendments made in Applicants' Amendment Accompanying Request for Reconsideration filed December 22, 2006, but acknowledge that those amendments may have introduced an unintended ambiguity that is resolved by the current amendments to the claims. Applicants submit that the claims, as amended herein, are patentable for the reasons similar to those presented in Applicants' Amendment Accompanying Request for Reconsideration filed December 22, 2006.


In particular, the Office Action now cites FIGs. 6-11 and the description thereof in columns 10 and 11 as teaching the recitations of Claim 1. See Office Action, pp. 2 and 3. FIGs. 6-11 show monolithic substrates including a single die 10 with layers 16, including conductive and insulative layers, added thereto. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Wood, however, that the conductive layers provide *electrical* interconnection among a plurality of dice. Accordingly, the material from Wood cited in the Office Action does not disclose or suggest all of the recitations of amended independent Claims 1, 12, 23 and 27.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that amended independent Claims 1, 12, 23 and 27 are patentable over Wood. Applicants also submit that dependent Claims 3-11, 13-22, 24-26 and 28-39 are patentable at least by virtue of the patentability of the various ones of independent Claims 1, 12, 23 and 27 from which they depend. Applicants further submit that several of the dependent claims are separately patentable for at least the reasons discussed in Applicants' Amendment filed October 24, 2006, which have not been addressed in the Office Action.

As all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the claims and passing of the application to issue in due course. Applicants urge the Examiner to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at (919) 854-1400 to resolve any remaining formal issues.

In re: Baek et al.  
Serial No.: 10/824,111  
Filed: April 14, 2004  
Page 9 of 9

Respectfully submitted,




Grant J. Scott  
Registration No. 36,925

**Customer Number 20792**

Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.  
P.O. Box 37428  
Raleigh, NC 27627  
919-854-1400  
919-854-1401 (Fax)

**CERTIFICATION OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4) to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on June 13, 2007.



Candi L. Riggs